



INDIANA UTILITY REGULATORY COMMISSION
302 W. WASHINGTON STREET, SUITE E-306
INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA 46204-2764

<http://www.state.in.us/iurc/>
Office: (317) 232-2701
Facsimile: (317) 232-6758

IN THE MATTER OF THE PETITION OF)
INDIANA BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY,)
INCORPORATED ("SBC INDIANA") FOR A)
CERTIFICATE OF TERRITORIAL)
AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE FACILITIES-)
BASED AND RESOLD TELECOMMUNI-)
CATIONS SERVICES, INCLUDING LOCAL)
EXCHANGE, INTEREXCHANGE,)
EXCHANGE ACCESS (BOTH SWITCHED)
AND SPECIAL ACCESS), OPERATOR,)
PRIVATE LINE, VERTICAL, AND CALLER)
ID SERVICES WITHIN VERIZON'S AND)
SPRINT'S SERVICE TERRITORIES AND)
OUTSIDE OF SBC INDIANA'S EXISTING)
SERVICE TERRITORY, AND FOR THE)
COMMISSION TO EXERCISE ITS)
STATUTORY AUTHORITY UNDER I.C.)
8-1-2.6 ET SEQ. TO DECLINE TO)
EXERCISE ITS JURISDICTION, IN WHOLE)
OR IN PART, AND USE ALTERNATIVE)
REGULATORY PROCEDURES AND)
STANDARDS FOR SBC INDIANA'S)
PROVISION OF SUCH SERVICES AND)
FOR THE COMMISSION'S CONSENT TO)
BOARDS OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS)
FOR SBC INDIANA TO OCCUPY THE)
PUBLIC RIGHTS-OF-WAY PURSUANT)
TO I.C. 36-2-2-23.)

FILED

DEC 16 2004

INDIANA UTILITY
REGULATORY COMMISSION

CAUSE NO. 42753

You are hereby notified that on this date, the Indiana Utility Regulatory Commission ("Commission") has caused the following entry to be made:

On November 23, 2004, SBC Indiana ("Petitioner") filed its Petition for a certificate of territorial authority, as herein captioned ("Petition").


The Presiding Officers, having reviewed the information contained in the Petitioner's Petition and being duly advised in the premises, finds as follows:

Petitioner shall answer the following data requests on or before January 31, 2005:


1. Does SBC Indiana request this CTA to provide telecommunications service throughout the state of Indiana, except in SBC Indiana's existing ILEC territory? (A.7. page 3)

2. Does SBC Indiana propose this Competitive Local Exchange Carrier ("CLEC") as a separate subsidiary or an affiliate of SBC?
3. If the answer to question number 2 is affirmative, does SBC Indiana propose to have a separate name for the subsidiary or affiliate?
4. If the answer to question number 2 is no, will SBC Indiana keep the CLEC books separate from the ILEC? If so, how?
5. Other CLECs formed by Indiana ILECs have agreed to certain conditions meant to prevent (1) cross-subsidization of competitive service offerings through rates charged for non-competitive services provided by the affiliated incumbent, and (2) the potential to gain market advantage over competitors due to the affiliation with an incumbent. Will SBC Indiana address its willingness to entertain similar conditions?
6. Does SBC plan to surrender any other CTA in Indiana?
7. Please identify the extent to which there may be an overlap and/or potential packaging of products and services sold by any other SBC entity in Indiana.
8. Please explain SBC's plans to provide local loops to customers of the proposed CLEC.
9. Will Customer Specific Offerings ("CSOs") be offered or utilized by this CLEC subsidiary or affiliate?
10. Please describe how the proposed CLEC will obtain service (resale and/or Interconnection, or other method) from SBC Indiana and any other Incumbent Local Exchange Carrier ("ILEC").
11. Will affiliate agreements be executed relating to this CLEC?

IT IS SO ORDERED.



Larry S. Landis, Commissioner



Lorraine Hitz-Bradley, Administrative Law Judge

Date: December 16, 2004